



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and it results in a version which modernizes and even neutralizes the ardent apostle. The violent overstatement that Paul "explicitly sanctions" second marriages in 1 Cor. 7:8 is used to support the explanation of 1 Tim. 3:2, "husband of one wife," as forbidding unchastity in a bishop! Such a method easily finds election conditioned by foreknowledge, and, following Beyschlag, Dr. Gilbert softens the Pauline thought still further by a distinction between messianic privilege and eternal salvation. Some details seem to the reviewer clearly erroneous, as that Christ is the specific *object* of Christian faith (p. 113), or that "I" in Romans, chap. 7, is for Paul rather than an ideal argumentative "I," or the phrase "eloquence of angels" for 1 Cor. 13:1.

The main dissent, however, must be from the effort to harmonize by means of a rationalistic exegesis, and by the use of the *Lehrbegriff* method, with its artificializing, scholasticizing misconception of the biblical writers. The latter method confuses what is homiletic and what is doctrinal, what is religious and what is theological. It forgets that rhetorical feeling may change the word without changing the idea. The harmonizing exegesis seems to be influenced by interests that belong to apologetics or systematic theology. The more radical treatment that leaves inconsistencies to a modern reader need not impair the religious value of Scripture.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.

THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By EZRA P. GOULD. ("New Testament Handbooks," edited by Shailer Mathews.) New York: Macmillan, 1900. Pp. xvi + 221. \$0.75.

AN OUTLINE OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. By DAVID FOSTER ESTES. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1900. Pp. vi + 253. \$1.25.

THESE two books cover practically the same ground, but in a strikingly different way. Dr. Gould's is more comprehensive in its treatment and more vigorous in its style of thought. In fact, it is much more of a book than we should look for after working through his commentary on Mark.

It is a clear illustration of the principle that biblical theology, as a historical science, depends for its conclusions on the results of a historical criticism and a historical exegesis of its sources — a principle

which the author openly avows in the opening pages of his book. Unfortunately, however, the criticism and the exegesis which he employs are antiquated, making it thus almost inevitable that his theological conceptions of the writings discussed should be open to question.

This is seen especially in his tendency to assign to an anti-Pauline theology such writings as Ephesians, Colossians, the Pastorals, Hebrews, 2 Peter, Jude, and the Johannine literature on the basis of an exegesis which interprets them as dominated more or less by an Alexandrian philosophy, and of a criticism which relegates them to a second-century date.

The book is also a clear illustration of the fact that a man's criticism and exegesis are controlled by his philosophical ideas.

This is evident from the fact that fundamental to his conception of New Testament theology is his belief that there have passed over into the writings of the newer dispensation the essential contrasts which classify the literature of the older period—the contrast of prophet and priest, of prophet and scribe, of prophet and philosopher, the growth and contrasts of the messianic idea.

In these contrasts the prophet stands for that which is spiritually ideal and finds its highest manifestation in the teaching of Jesus. (Logia and Mark.)

This spiritual teaching of Jesus reacts in the early teaching of the Twelve toward a Jewish messianism (early chapters of Acts); is partially recovered by Paul to spirituality and catholicity, but in the process becomes mixed with dogmatic and priestly elements (Pauline epistles); is later, through the consequent debate of the Twelve with Paul, brought into clear statement by them (James, 1 Peter, and later synoptic additions); and finally, under the influence of Alexandrianism, goes out almost necessarily into a system of speculative philosophy.

To those who follow carefully Dr. Gould's detailed working out of these regulative ideas it will not be difficult to discover that he is largely in the grasp of an immanistic metaphysics.

Dr. Estes goes to the opposite extreme from Dr. Gould, accepting all the canonical New Testament books as authentic documents and so distinguishing among them rather as to stages of apostolic thinking than as to classes of apostolic and non-apostolic thought.

Following the strict idea of biblical theology, the author might be expected to develop these stages historically; but he has evidently confused his conception of biblical theology with that of biblical dogmatics, giving up the sequential treatment and insisting, as

characteristic of his method, on a unity of treatment, as not only presupposed by the nature of the science, but as demanded by the "historic and demonstrable unity of the New Testament itself" (p. 11).

The book is admirable for its clearness and conciseness of style, but we fear it will prove as unsatisfactory through the evident presence behind it of an apologetic motive as Dr. Gould's through the clear presence there of a motive which, if termed at all, must be considered rationalistic.

M. W. JACOBUS.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hartford, Conn.

DIE NEUTESTAMENTLICHE LEHRE VON DER SELIGKEIT UND IHRE BEDEUTUNG FÜR DIE GEGENWART. Dargestellt von ARTHUR TITIUS. 4 Bände. Tübingen: Mohr, 1895-1900.

I. Jesu Lehre vom Reich Gottes. Pp. xii+199. M. 3.60.—II. Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit. Pp. ix+290. M. 6.40.—III. Die Johanneische Anschauung unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit. Pp. viii+143. M. 3.20.—IV. Die vulgäre Anschauung von der Seligkeit im Urchristenthum, ihre Entwicklung bis zum Uebergang in katholische Formen. Pp. xi+250. M. 5.80.

THIS is a work of more than ordinary importance. Such is the opinion of the German university authorities, for the publication of the first volume in 1895 was followed by the call of the author from his place as Privatdocent in Berlin to an extraordinary professorship at Kiel, and between the third and fourth parts (the last three being all published in 1900) he was made doctor of theology by Berlin. A careful examination of the work bears out this official judgment. Titius possesses the gift of speech in a remarkable degree, reminding one of Harnack in this respect. There is everywhere the copious flow of a mind alert and fully informed as to what it wishes to say. Every sentence is full of matter, and the whole presses onward with the irresistible current of a great stream of systematic truth.

The work is of great importance, as it seems to this reviewer, because marking, in conjunction with Kaftan's *Dogmatik*, a high point in the re-establishment among Ritschlians of the great evangelical positions which Ritschl himself somewhat obscured. In a sense, this is a book of extreme radical positions. The criticism of the New Testament is given the fullest play. The Apocalypse, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Acts are all reckoned to the postcanonical writings, and put on